arXiv:1510.08814v1 [math.PR] 29 Oct 2015

Rigidity hierarchy in random point fields: random polynomials and determinantal processes

Subhroshekhar Ghosh
Princeton University
subhrowork@gmail.com

Manjunath Krishnapur
Indian Institute of Science
manju@math.iisc.ernet.in

October 30, 2015

Abstract

In certain point processes, the configuration of points outside a bounded domain determines certain features of the point process within the domain. This notion, called rigidity, was introduced in [GP]. In this paper, rigidity and the related notion of tolerance are studied more systematically and many new examples of point processes with rigidity of various levels are found. Natural classes of point processes such as determinantal point processes, zero sets of Gaussian entire functions and perturbed lattices are studied from the point of view of rigidity. In particular, a class of point processes with arbitrarily high levels of rigidity is introduced.

1 Introduction

A point process on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is a random locally finite subset. The most studied among these are the Poisson point processes. In a Poisson process, for any Borel subset $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, the configuration of points of the point process that fall inside D and the configuration of points that fall inside D^c are independent. For a general point process they are not. In [GP], a surprising phenomenon diametrically opposite to independence was discovered to occur in certain point processes: Some features of the configuration of points inside D (eg., the number of points that fall in D) may be determined, almost surely, by the configuration of points in D^c!

This phenomenon was called *rigidity* in [GP]. It was shown there that for the infinite Ginibre ensemble (recalled more precisely in Result 1) on $\mathbb{R}^2$, the number

of points inside a bounded region is determined by the configuration of points outside. It was also shows that for the zeroes of the canonical Gaussian entire function (see Result 2), the number of points as well as the center of mass of the points in a bounded region are determined by the configuration of points outside. In both cases it was shown, in a precise sense, that nothing more than this can be determined by the configuration outside.

The goal of this paper is to systematically explore the extent of rigidity in several natural point processes. In this section, we give definitions of rigidity and tolerance following [GP], but in a more general setting. Then we recall the known examples and related results in the literature. Further, we mention certain applications to the study of point processes to which these notions have been crucial. In Section 2 we state the new results of this paper. In later sections we give proofs of these results.

Let Ξ be a locally compact topological space. Let $\mathcal{M}_p(\Xi)$ denote the space of integer-valued Radon measures on Ξ and let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_p(\Xi)$ denote the collection of counting measures of locally finite subsets of Ξ. Recall that $\mathcal{M}_p(\Xi)$ is itself a Polish space with the topology of vague convergence and $\mathcal{S}$ is an open subset of $\mathcal{M}_p(\Xi)$ which endows them with a Borel sigma-algebra. A *point process* is a random variable Π defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and taking values in $\mathcal{M}_p(\Xi)$. If $\Pi \in \mathcal{S}$ $a.s.$, then it is said to be a *simple* point process. For more details on point processes, we refer the reader to [DaV] and [Ka].

If $D \subseteq \Xi$ is a Borel set, let $\mathcal{S}_D = \{\theta \in \mathcal{S} : \theta(D^c) = 0\}$. For a point process Π on Ξ, let Π_D denote the restriction of Π to D, i.e., the point process on Ξ satisfying $\Pi_D(A) = \Pi(A \cap D)$. Let $\sigma\{\Pi_D\}$ denote the sigma-algebra generated by Π_D. Random variables measurable with respect to $\sigma\{\Pi_D\}$ are precisely those of the form $f(\Pi_D)$ where $f : \mathcal{S}_D \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is measurable.

The key object in our study is the sigma-algebra $\mathcal{R}_D := \sigma(\Pi_D) \cap \sigma(\Pi_{D^c})$. If Y is an $\mathcal{R}_D$-measurable random variable, then there exist measurable functions $f_{\text{in}} : \mathcal{S}_D \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $f_{\text{out}} : \mathcal{S}_{D^c} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that $Y = f_{\text{in}}(\Pi_D)$ $a.s.$ and $Y = f_{\text{out}}(\Pi_{D^c})$ $a.s.$ Thus, $\mathcal{R}_D$-measurable random variables are precisely those features of Π_D which can be inferred exactly (with probability one), from a knowledge of the configuration Π_{D^c}.

Definition 1 (Rigidity)**.** *A measurable function $f : \mathcal{S}_D \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is said to be rigid for the pair (Π, D) if $f(\Pi_D)$ is $\mathcal{R}_D$-measurable.*

Clearly, this is interesting only if $f(\Pi_D)$ is not a constant. In that case, $\mathcal{R}_D$ contains events with non-trivial probability.

The most basic feature of interest is the number of points in D, i.e., $N_D : \mathcal{S}_D \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as $N_D(\Pi) = \Pi(D)$. If N_D is rigid for all pre-compact $D \subseteq \Xi$, then we say that Π exhibits *rigidity of numbers*.

Once we establish that there are rigid functions, the natural question is, how many? This is captured by the following definition. We write $\sigma\{Y_i : i \in I\}$ for the sigma-algebra generated by Y_i, $i \in I$.

Definition 2 (Tolerance)**.** *Let $f_1, \ldots, f_m : \mathcal{S}_D \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be measurable functions. We say that the pair (Π, D) is tolerant subject to $\{f_1, \ldots, f_m\}$ if $\sigma\{f_1(\Pi_D), \ldots, f_m(\Pi_D)\}$ and $\mathcal{R}_D$ are equal up to $\mathbb{P}$-null sets.*

The definition means that each f_i is rigid for (Π, D) and for every $A \in \mathcal{R}_D$, there is a $B \in \sigma\{f_1(\Pi_D), \ldots, f_m(\Pi_D)\}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(A \Delta B) = 0$. Of course, we may allow $m = \infty$ and make the same definition. This definition captures the idea that nothing more than $f_i(\Pi_D)$, $i \leq m$, can be determined by the outside configuration Π_{D^c}. Or more precisely, any feature of the point process inside D that can be determined by the outside configuration is equal (almost surely) to a function of these m features.

However, there are other ways to capture the same idea. In most of the cases that we encounter, the following stronger form of tolerance holds.

Definition 3 (Tolerance - strong form)**.** *In the language of Definition 2, we say that (Π, D) is strongly tolerant subject to $\{f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m\}$ if, almost surely, the conditional distribution of Π_D given Π_{D^c} is mutually absolutely continuous to the conditional distribution of Π_D given $\sigma\{f_1(\Pi_D), \ldots, f_m(\Pi_D)\}$.*

There are other possible definitions of tolerance that lie between these two. In section 7 we discuss these and also explain the relationship between tolerance and strong tolerance. In particular, it is shown that strong tolerance implies tolerance, as the name suggests.

In general, the extent of rigidity could depend not only on the underlying point process but also on the sub-domain D. In almost all cases considered in this paper, the point process is on $\mathbb{R}^2$ and the extent of rigidity is the same for all bounded subsets D. Hence we make the following definition.

If Π is a point process on $\mathbb{R}^2 \cong \mathbb{C}$ with finite number of points (i.e., $\Pi(\mathbb{C}) < \infty$ $a.s.$), define $M_k(\Pi) = \int_{\mathbb{C}} z^k d\Pi(z)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For a general point process $M_k(\Pi_D)$ makes sense for any bounded Borel set D. Especially significant is $M_0(\Pi_D)$, the number of points of Π in D. which we also denote by N_D.

Definition 4. *A simple point process Π on the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ is said to be rigid at level k if the following conditions are satisfied.*

1. *For any bounded open set D, the pair (Π, D) is strongly tolerant subject to $\{M_0, \ldots, M_{k-1}\}$,*
2. *Given $M_j(\Pi_D) = m_j$ for $0 \leq j \leq k-1$, the conditional distribution of Π_D is mutually absolutely continuous to Lebesgue measure on the manifold*

$$\{(z_1, \ldots, z_{m_0}) \in D^{m_0} \ : \ z_1^j + \ldots + z_{m_0}^j = m_j \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq k-1\}.$$

This should hold for (almost) every $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $m_1, \ldots, m_{k-1} \in \mathbb{C}$.

Clearly, analogous definitions can be made with any functions $\phi_j : \mathbb{C} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ by defining tolerance subject to the linear statistics $\Lambda_j(\Pi_D) = \int_D \phi_j(x) d\Pi(x)$, $0 \leq j \leq k$. Such definitions can be extended beyond the complex plane. Even on the complex plane, one could consider non-holomorphic moments $M_{j,k}(\Pi_D) := \int_D z^j \bar{z}^k d\Pi_D(z)$, and for point processes that do not have joint intensities with respect to Lebesgue measure (for instance, point processes on $\mathbb{Z}^2$), etc. While the concepts of rigidity and tolerance and rigidity of numbers as given in the first three definitions are somehow fundamental, the definition of "rigid up to level k" in the last definition is deliberately made specific to the plane, and for the sake of conciseness in the statement of our results.

Known examples of rigidity and tolerance: A Poisson process has no rigidity. In other words, $\mathcal{R}_D$ is trivial for any D. It is interesting and non-trivial that there are point processes with any rigidity at all. We quote three sample results. The first two are from [GP] while the last is from [G-I].

Infinite Ginibre ensemble in the complex plane: This is the determinantal point process defined by the kernel $e^{z\bar{w}}$ with respect to the measure $\frac{1}{\pi} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|z|^2}$ on the complex plane. For the definition of a determinantal point process, we refer the reader to [Sosh] or chapter 4 of [HKPV] (a brief description is given in Section 2). The infinite Ginibre ensemble is a translation and rotation invariant simple point process on the plane.

Result 1 ([GP]). *The infinite Ginibre ensemble is rigid at level* 1.

Informally, the result says that for any bounded set D, from the knowledge of Π_{D^c}, it is possible to determine the number of points in Π_D, but nothing more can be determined.

Zero set of the canonical Gaussian entire function: Let Π be the zero set of the random entire function $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \xi_n \frac{z^n}{\sqrt{n!}}$ where ξ_n are i.i.d. standard complex Gaussian random variables (each ξ_n has density $\frac{1}{\pi} e^{-|z|^2}$). Then, Π is a translation and rotation invariant simple point process on the plane (see [ST1] for details).

Result 2 ([GP]). *The zero set of the Gaussian entire function is rigid at level* 2.

Informally, this means that for any bounded set D, from the knowledge of Π_{D^c}, it is possible to determine the number of points in Π_D and the center of mass of these points, but nothing more.

Sine-kernel determinantal point process on $\mathbb{R}$: This is the determinantal point process with kernel $\frac{\sin(x-y)}{x-y}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$. This is a translation invariant simple point process (see section 2 of [Sosh]) that arises in the study of Hermitian random matrices.

Result 3. *([G-I]) The sine-kernel determinantal point process has rigidity of numbers.*

A similar result was shown for a wide class of translation invariant determinantal point processes on the real line. These determinantal processes (see Soshnikov [Sosh] and Lyons and Steif [LySt]) have kernels of the form $\hat{g}(x-y)$ where $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $0 \leq g \leq 1$. See [G-I] for details.

Bufetov [Buf-3] showed rigidity for determinantal point process with Airy, Bessel and Gamma kernels. These point processes are not translation invariant. In addition, Bufetov and Qiu [BQ], have shown rigidity for a class of determinantal processes in the plane. Their result has a strong overlap with, but does not subsume, Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 that we prove in this paper. In addition, it is worth mentioning that in [BDQ], Bufetov, Dabrowski and Qiu study one-sided rigidity. In our terminology, this corresponds to taking $\Xi = \mathbb{R}$ and $D = [a, \infty)$. Bufetov's result may be the only known result that proves rigidity for unbounded sets, although one may mention that analogous results are known in the theory of Gaussian processes (see the book [DM] for instance).

Related results: In [OsSh], Osada and Shirai showed that for the Ginibre ensemble, the Palm measures with respect to different point sets are mutually absolutely continuous if the conditioning set of points have the same cardinality, and are mutually absolutely continuous otherwise. Such dichotomy is similar in spirit to, and is, in fact, closely related with the rigidity phenomena under our consideration. For more on this theme, we refer the reader to the upcoming article [G-II].

Applications to other aspects of point processes: The study of rigidity, although natural, is not an end in itself. Rigidity phenomena have been exploited to answer questions on point processes and stochastic geometry that are interesting in their own right.

In [G-I], rigidity of the sine kernel process (Result 3) was exploited to answer a completeness question related to exponential functions coming from the point process. In [GKP], the authors used an understanding of the rigidity behaviour of the Ginibre ensemble and the zero set of the Gaussian entire function (Result 1 and Result 2) in order to study continuum percolation on these models. In particular, they showed the existence of a non-trivial critical radius for percolation, and established the uniqueness of the infinite cluster in the supercritical regime.

In [Os], an understanding of quasi-Gibbs property, which has a somewhat similar flavour to rigidity and tolerance, was used to define an infinite particle SDE for invariant dynamics on the Ginibre process. To execute a similar programme for invariant dynamics on the zero set of the Gaussian entire function, one faces new challenges involving the higher level of rigidity in Result 2, and it is a topic of current research.

2 Our results

Now we present our results along with some remarks on our motivations and on what more could be true but are not known.

Point processes with higher levels of rigidity: In Results 1 and 2 we have seen point process that are rigid at level 1 and at level 2. Are there natural point processes that exhibit higher levels of rigidity? This would mean that for some $k \geq 3$ and any bounded set D, the sum of kth powers of the points of the process that fall in D can be determined by the outside configuration Π_{D^c}.

We answer in the affirmative, by constructing zero sets of Gaussian entire functions with arbitrarily high levels of rigidity.

Definition 5. *For a real number $\alpha > 0$, the α-GAF is the random entire function*

$$f_\alpha(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\xi_k}{(k!)^{\alpha/2}} z^k$$

where ξ_k are i.i.d. standard complex Gaussian random variables.

For $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, we get back the canonical planar Gaussian entire function whose zero set is a translation-invariant point process. For any $\alpha \neq \frac{1}{2}$, the zero set of α-GAFs is not translation-invariant in the plane. Figure **??** on the last page shows how the parameter α affects the distribution of the zeroes.

We are not aware of any translation invariant point processes that is rigid at level 3 or more, but the following theorem at least gives natural enough point processes with arbitrarily high levels of rigidity.

Theorem 2.1. *The zero set of the α-GAF is rigid at level $k \geq 1$ whenever $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{k}, \frac{1}{k-1}]$.*

Rigidity of determinantal point processes: In Result 1 and Result 3, we saw determinantal point processes on $\mathbb{R}^2$ and on $\mathbb{R}$ that are rigid at level 1 (i.e., for any bounded set D, the number of points of the process that fall inside D is determined by the outside configuration Π_{D^c}, but nothing more). What about a general determinantal point process?

Let us recall that a determinantal point process (henceforth abbreviated as d.p.p.) on Ξ with a Hermitian kernel $K : \Xi \times \Xi \to \mathbb{C}$ (Hermitian means that $K(x, y) = \overline{K(y, x)}$) and a (Radon) measure μ, is a point process whose joint intensities (also called correlation functions) with respect to μ are given by

$$\rho_k(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = \det\left(K(x_i, x_j)\right)_{i,j \leq k}$$

for any $k \geq 1$ and any $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in \Xi$. We refer to [HKPV], chapters 1 and 4, for more details of these notions. All information about a determinantal process is in the kernel K, once the measure μ is fixed. For $D \subseteq \Xi$, we define the integral operator $\mathcal{K}_D : L^2(D, \mu) \mapsto L^2(D, \mu)$ by

$$(\mathcal{K}_D f)(x) = \int_D K(x, y) f(y) d\mu(y).$$

We say that the kernel K is locally of trace-class if for every $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ that is pre-compact, the operator $\mathcal{K}_D$ is of trace-class.

Is it possible to characterize the rigidity behaviour of a determinatal point process in terms of the kernel? We provide a partial answer to this question by specifying conditions on the pair (K, μ) that mandate a certain rigidity behaviour of the determinantal process. More specifically, we investigate conditions under which a determinantal process has rigidity of numbers. Recall that this means that for any $D \subseteq \Xi$ whose closure is compact, the counting function $N_D : \mathcal{S}_D \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, is rigid.

To state our first result, we recall the following result of Machchi and Soshnikov (see Theorem 3 in Soshnikov [Sosh]): Let K be locally of trace-class and Hermitian. Then, a determinantal point process with the pair (K, μ) exists if and only if $0 \leq \mathcal{K} \leq I$. Equivalently, the spectrum of $\mathcal{K}$ is contained in $[0, 1]$. Clearly $\mathcal{K}$ defines a projection operator if and only if its spectrum is contained in $\{0, 1\}$. Now we are ready to state a necessary condition for a determinantal point process to have rigidity of numbers.

Theorem 2.2. *Let Π be a determinantal point process with kernel K and background measure μ. If the integral operator $\mathcal{K}$ associated to K is not a projection operator, then Π does not exhibit rigidity of numbers.*

It is an interesting question to ask whether conversely, every projection determinantal point process has rigidity of numbers. This is certainly true for the infinite Ginibre ensemble (Result 1) and for the sine-kernel process on the line (Result 3), but is not true in complete generality.

A counter-example is provided by the Bergman determinantal point process, which is a determinantal process on the unit disk $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ whose kernel is the Bergman kernel $K(z, w) = (1 - z\bar{w})^{-2}$ and $d\mu(z) = \pi^{-1} dm(z)$ is the normalized Lebesgue measure on the unit disk. The corresponding operator is the projection from $L^2(\mu)$ onto the subspace of square integrable holomorphic functions. Holroyd and Soo [HS] have shown that this determinantal process is insertion tolerant and deletion tolerant[1]. Consequently it does not have rigidity of numbers.

[1] A point process Π on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is said to be insertion tolerant if for any set subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with positive, finite Lebesgue measure, if a point U is sampled uniformly from A and added to Π, the distribution of the resulting point process $\Pi + \delta_U$, is absolutely continuous to the distribution of Π. Poisson process is an obvious example. Evidently, an insertion tolerant point process does not have rigidity of numbers.

However, this is an example where the ambient space (the hyperbolic plane) is non-Euclidean, in particular it is non-amenable. This still leaves open the question of whether a translation-invariant determinantal point process on a $\mathbb{R}^d$ given by a projection kernel necessarily exhibits rigidity of numbers, or more generally, what can be said about the rigidity properties of such point processes. We do not have a complete answer, but we prove rigidity of numbers or the lack of it for a class of determinantal processes in the plane.

Radial determinantal processes in the plane: Let μ be a radially symmetric probability measure on the complex plane such that $c_j^{-1} := \int_0^\infty |z|^{2j} d\mu(z) < \infty$ for all j. Then $\{\sqrt{c_j} z^j : j \geq 0\}$ is an orthonormal set in $L^2(\mu)$. It is an orthonormal basis for the subspace of holomorphic functions in $L^2(\mu)$ and the projection operator onto this closed subspace is given by the kernel $K(z,w) = \sum_{j=0}^\infty c_j z^j \overline{w}^j$. These processes include the infinite Ginibre ensemble (when μ is standard complex Gaussian measure on the plane) and the Bergman determinantal process (when μ is normalized uniform measure on the unit disk).

Before stating the result, we introduce the following quantities.

$$\mu_j := \frac{c_j}{c_{j+1}}, \qquad \sigma_j := \frac{\mu_{j+1}}{\mu_j} - 1, \qquad \nu_j := \frac{\mu_{j+3}\mu_{j+2}\mu_{j+1}}{\mu_j} - 4\frac{\mu_{j+2}\mu_{j+1}}{\mu_j^2} + 6\frac{\mu_{j+1}}{\mu_j} - 3.$$

In the setting described so far, we prove the following theorems.

Theorem 2.3. *Let Π be the determinantal point process with kernel K with respect to the radial measure μ. If $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \sigma_j < \infty$, then the process Π does not exhibit rigidity of numbers.*

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \nu_j < \infty$ and $\sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j^4 \nu_j = o(\mu_k^4)$. Then, Π does exhibit rigidity of numbers.*

Suppose that in addition to the previous conditions, the measure μ is absolutely continuous w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{C}$, and that for some integer $a \geq 1$ we have $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu_j^{-a} < \infty$. Then, Π is rigid at level 1.

The condition $\sum_j \sigma_j < \infty$ in Theorem 2.3 is satisfied if $\mu_j = A + Bj^{-1} + O(j^{-2})$. The conditions in Theorem 2.4 are satisfied if $\mu_j = Cj^a(1 + Aj^{-1} + O(j^{-2}))$. The latter is certainly the case if μ has density proportional to $|z|^\alpha e^{-|z|^\beta}$. This includes the infinite Ginibre ensemble with $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta = 2$.

Remark 2.1. *The assumption of absolute continuity on the measure γ is made because we defined rigidity at level k with respect to Lebesgue measure on the plane. In general, strong tolerance holds, and in fact the conditional distribution (given Π_{D^c}) of the vector of $N(D)$ points inside the disk, when put in a uniform random order, is mutually absolutely continuous to $\gamma^{\otimes N(D)}$. The proof goes through with minor changes.*

While Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 cover a good class of radially symmetric determinantal processes, it would be definitely very interesting to sharpen the dichotomy

present in these two theorems. In particular, would it be possible to extend this dichotomy and establish that it is indeed the compactness or the non-compactness of the measure γ that determines the rigidity behaviour of the determinantal process.

Perturbed lattice: By perturbed lattice we mean a point process got by perturbing the points of a lattice by independent random variables. This is the point process whose points are $\{k + \xi_k : k \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ where ξ_k are independent $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random vectors.

In one dimension, if the perturbations are i.i.d., non-degenerate and have finite variance, then it can be shown that the resulting point process is rigid at level 1. For i.i.d. lattice perturbations of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, the situation is similar these results are due to Holroyd and Soo [HS]. Remarkably, for i.i.d. perturbations by isotropic Gaussians in dimensions $d \geq 3$, it is known ([PS]) that there is a phase transition in the variance of the perturbing Gaussian. Then, there is a critical σ_c such that if the variance of the perturbing Gaussians is more than σ_c^2, then the point process is deletion tolerant[2], while for perturbations with variance less than σ_c^2 it is rigid (at level 1).

We return to dimension 1 and Gaussian perturbations, but the perturbations are no longer identically distributed. If we posit a power law growth for the variances of the perturbations, we obtain a phase transition in the rigidity behaviour of Gaussian perturbations of $\mathbb{Z}$ as follows.

Theorem 2.5. *Consider the point process $\mathcal{X}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ which is the random point set given by $\{k + Z_k : k \in \mathbb{Z}, Z_k$ independent $N(0, \sigma_\beta(k))\}$, where $\sigma_\beta(k) = |k|^\beta$. Then $\mathcal{X}$ is insertion tolerant if $\beta > 1/2$, and is rigid (at level 1) if $\beta \leq 1/2$.*

3 Rigidity of α-GAFs: Proof of Theorem 2.1

Let f_α be the α-Gaussian analytic function (abbreviated as α-GAF) defined by

$$f_\alpha(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\xi_j}{(j!)^{\alpha/2}}.$$

In this section, $\mathcal{Z}_\alpha$ will denote the point process of zeroes of f_α. Our goal is to establish that $\mathcal{Z}_\alpha$ is rigid at level k_α where $\frac{1}{k_\alpha} < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{k_\alpha - 1}$.

In section 3.1 we prove the desired level of rigidity by estimating the variance of certain linear statistics of $\mathcal{Z}_\alpha$. In section 3.2 the tolerance behaviour is discussed. Theorem 2.1 follows from Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.

[2]A point process Π is said to be deletion tolerant if for any randomly chosen point Z of Π, the distribution of the point process $\Pi - \delta_Z$ got by deleting the point at Z, is absolutely continuous to the distribution of Π.

3.1 Rigidity of α-GAF: variance of linear statistics

As in all proofs of rigidity to date, we show rigidity by proving upper bounds on the variance of appropriate linear statistics of the point process of zeroes.

Let φ be a C_c^∞ function on $\mathbb{C}$, and let $L > 0$. Define $\varphi_L(z) = \varphi(z/L)$. We are interested in the asymptotics of $\mathrm{Var}\left(\int \varphi_L \, d\mathcal{Z}_\alpha\right)$ as $L \to \infty$. We will show that this quantity goes to zero at the rate $L^{-2/\alpha}$, which roughly corresponds to the rigidity of the first $\lfloor 2/\alpha \rfloor$ moments of the inside points (starting from the zeroth moment, which is the number of points).

The random analytic function f_α is a complex Gaussian field on $\mathbb{C}$ whose covariance kernel of which is given by

$$K_\alpha(z,w) := \mathbb{E}[f_\alpha(z)\overline{f_\alpha(w)}] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(z\overline{w})^j}{(j!)^\alpha}.$$

The normalized random function $\hat{f}_\alpha(z) := f_\alpha(z)/\sqrt{K(z,z)}$ has covariance

$$\theta_\alpha(z,w) := \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}_\alpha(z)\overline{f_\alpha(w)}] = \frac{K(z,w)}{\sqrt{K(z,z)K(w,w)}}.$$

The variance of linear statistics will be expressed in terms of the quantity

$$\psi_\alpha(z,w) := \mathbb{E}[\log|\hat{f}_\alpha(z)| \cdot \log|\hat{f}_\alpha(w)|] = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\theta_\alpha(z,w)|^{2j}}{j^2}.$$

It is known (see [HKPV], combine equation (3.5.2) and Lemma 3.5.2 in chapter 3) that

$$\mathrm{Var}\left(\int \varphi_L \, d\mathcal{Z}_\alpha\right) = \iint \Delta\varphi_L(z)\Delta\varphi_L(w)\psi_\alpha(z,w)dm(z)dm(w).$$

Here and everywhere in the paper, we use $dm(z)$ to denote Lebesgue measure.

Since $|\theta_\alpha(z,w)| \le 1$, we have the comparison $|\theta_\alpha(z,w)|^2 \le \psi_\alpha(z,w) \le 2|\theta_\alpha(z,w)|^2$ (because $\sum j^{-2} \le 2$). This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}\left(\int \varphi_L \, d\mathcal{Z}_\alpha\right) &\le 2\iint |\Delta\varphi_L(z)\Delta\varphi_L(w)| \cdot |\theta_\alpha(z,w)|^2 dm(z)dm(w) \\ &= 2\iint |\Delta\varphi(z)\Delta\varphi(w)| \cdot |\theta_\alpha(Lz,Lw)|^2 dm(z)dm(w). \qquad (1)\end{aligned}$$

In the last step we made a simple change of variables.

We shall work with functions φ for which (a) $|\Delta\varphi|$ is radial and (b) $\Delta\varphi$ vanishes in a neighbourhood of the origin. Set

$$g(t,\beta) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^k}{(k!)^\beta}.$$

Then, using the fact that φ is a radial function, integrating over the angular variables in (1) we arrive at

$$\mathrm{Var}\left(\int \varphi_L \, d\mathcal{Z}_\alpha\right) \leq 2\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty |\Delta\varphi(r)\Delta\varphi(s)|\frac{g(L^4r^2s^2,2\alpha)}{g(L^2r^2,\alpha)g(L^2s^2,\alpha)}rsdrds.$$

The ratio of two successive terms in the expansion of $g(t,\beta)$ is

$$\frac{a_{k+1}}{a_k} = \frac{t}{(k+1)^\beta}.$$

This implies that a_k is maximised when $t = k^\beta$, in other words the maximiser is $k_* = t^{1/\beta}$ (strictly speaking $\lfloor t^{1/\beta}\rfloor$, but for ease of notation we ignore the symbol for integer part). The maximal term, via Stirling's approximation for the factorial, is

$$a_{k_*} = \exp\left(t^{1/\beta}\log t - \beta\frac{(t^{1/\beta}+\frac{1}{2})\log t}{\beta} + \beta t^{1/\beta}\right) = t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{\beta t^{1/\beta}}.$$

For a positive integer j, we have

$$a_{k_*+j} = \frac{t^{k_*+j}}{[(k_*+j)!]^\beta} = \frac{t^j}{k_*^{j\beta}}\prod_{i=1}^{j}\left(1+\frac{i}{k_*}\right)^{-\beta} \leq a_{k_*}\prod_{i=1}^{j}\left(1+\frac{i}{k_*}\right)^{-\beta}.$$

Each term $(1+\frac{i}{k_*})^{-\beta}$ in the product is less than 1. Further, for $i > \frac{1}{2}k_*$ this term is at most $(2/3)^\beta$. For $1 \leq i \leq \frac{1}{2}k_*$ by virtue of the inequality $e^{x/2} \leq 1+x \leq e^x$ for $0 < x < \frac{1}{2}$, the same term is between $e^{-\beta i/k_*}$ and $e^{-\beta i/2k_*}$. Putting all this together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{a_{k_*+j}}{a_{k_*}} &\leq \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{j-\frac{1}{2}k_*} \text{ if } j > \frac{1}{2}k_*,\\ e^{-\beta j^2/2k_*} \leq \frac{a_{k_*+j}}{a_{k_*}} &\leq e^{-\beta j^2/4k_*} \text{ if } j \leq \frac{1}{2}k_*.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $a_{k_*-j} = a_{k_*}\prod_{i=0}^{j-1}(1-\frac{i}{k_*})^\beta$ from which by analogous steps (use $e^{-2x} \leq 1-x \leq e^{-x}$ for $0 < x < \frac{1}{2}$) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{a_{k_*-j}}{a_{k_*}} &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{j-\frac{1}{2}k_*} \text{ if } j > \frac{1}{2}k_*,\\ e^{-\beta j^2/k_*} \leq \frac{a_{k_*+j}}{a_{k_*}} &\leq e^{-\beta j^2/2k_*} \text{ if } j \leq \frac{1}{2}k_*.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $j \geq \sqrt{k_*/c\beta}$, the quantity $a_{k_*\pm j}/a_{k_*}$ decays exponentially. The upshot of this is that $g(t,\beta)/a_{k_*}\sqrt{k_*}$ is bounded between positive quantities that depend only on β. Therefore, the ratio between the quantitites

$$\frac{g(L^4r^2s^2,2\alpha)}{g(L^2r^2,\alpha)g(L^2s^2,\alpha)}$$

and

$$\frac{\left(\frac{e^{2\alpha(L^4r^2s^2)^{1/2\alpha}}}{\sqrt{L^4r^2s^2}}(L^4r^2s^2)^{1/4\alpha}\right)}{\left(\frac{e^{\alpha(L^2r^2)^{1/a}}}{\sqrt{L^2r^2}}\cdot(L^2r^2)^{1/2\alpha}\frac{e^{\alpha(L^2s^2)^{1/a}}}{\sqrt{L^2s^2}}\cdot(L^2s^2)^{1/2\alpha}\right)^{-1}}=\frac{\exp(-\alpha L^{2/\alpha}(r^{1/\alpha}-s^{1/\alpha})^2)}{L^{1/\alpha}r^{1/2\alpha}s^{1/2\alpha}}$$

is bounded between two constants c_β and C_β.

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty|\Delta\varphi(r)\Delta\varphi(s)|\frac{g(L^4r^2s^2,2\alpha)}{g(L^2r^2,\alpha)g(L^2s^2,\alpha)}rsdrds \qquad (2)\\ &\le C_\beta\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty|\Delta\varphi(r)\Delta\varphi(s)|\exp(-\alpha L^{2/\alpha}(r^{1/\alpha}-s^{1/\alpha})^2)L^{-1/\alpha}r^{1-1/2\alpha}s^{1-1/2\alpha}drds,\end{aligned}$$

The last integral is well defined since $\Delta\varphi(r)\equiv 0$ for r close to 0. Recall that the bound in (2) is applicable to any φ satisfying

(a) $|\Delta\varphi|$ is a radial function and

(b) $\Delta\varphi$ vanishes in a neighbourhood of the origin.

We apply the bound to a specific family of radial functions. Given any $r_0>1$ and any $\varepsilon>0$, let φ_ε be a radial function such that

1. $\varphi_\varepsilon(r)=1$ for $r<2r_0$ and $\varphi_\varepsilon(r)=0$ for $r>2r_0e^{2/\varepsilon}$,
2. $|\varphi_\varepsilon'(r)|\le\frac{\varepsilon}{2r}$ and $|\varphi_\varepsilon''(r)|\le\frac{\varepsilon}{2r^2}$ for all r.

Such a function can be constructed by starting with the harmonic function $(\log|z|-\log a)/(\log b-\log a)$ for some $2r_0<a<b<2r_0e$ and convolving it with the indicator function of a disk $D(0,\delta)$ for a small enough $\delta>0$.

Consider the function $\Phi^\varepsilon(z)=z^k\varphi_\varepsilon(z)$. Observe that Φ^ε satisfies the conditions (a) and (b) above. As a result, Φ^ε satisfies the inequality (2). Hence we have

$$\mathrm{Var}\left(\int L^k\Phi_L^\varepsilon d\mathcal{Z}_\alpha\right)\le L^{2k-\frac{2}{\alpha}}\int|\Delta\Phi^\varepsilon(r)|^2r^{3-\frac{2}{\alpha}}dr+K(\Phi^\varepsilon)L^{2k}e^{-cL^{2/\alpha}}.$$

Observe that $2k-2/\alpha\le 0$, so $L^{2k-\frac{2}{\alpha}}\le 1$.

We claim that $\int|\Delta\Phi^\varepsilon(r)|^2r^{3-\frac{2}{\alpha}}dr=O(\varepsilon)$. To see this, applying Leibniz rule to compute the Laplacian $|\Delta\Phi^\varepsilon(r)|$ is supported on the set $2r_0\le r\le 2r_0\exp(2/\varepsilon)$, and is $O(\varepsilon r^{k-2})$ on this interval. This implies that

$$\int|\Delta\Phi^\varepsilon(r)|^2r^{3-\frac{2}{\alpha}}dr\le C_1\varepsilon^2\int_{2r_0}^{2r_0\exp(2/\varepsilon)}r^{2k-4+3-\frac{2}{\alpha}}dr\le C_2\varepsilon^2\int_{2r_0}^{2r_0\exp(2/\varepsilon)}\frac{dr}{r}\le C_3\varepsilon.$$

Now, given $\delta > 0$, first choose ε such that $\int |\Delta\Phi^{\varepsilon}(r)|^2 r^{3-\frac{2}{\alpha}} dr \leq \delta/2$; based on that choose L large enough such that $K(\Phi^{\varepsilon})L^{2k}e^{-cL^{2/\alpha}} \leq \delta/2$. Based on that choose L large enough such that $K(\Phi^{\varepsilon})L^{2k}e^{-cL^{2/\alpha}} \leq \delta/2$. This enables us to invoke Theorem 6.1 from [GP] (using the function $L^k\Phi_L^{\varepsilon}(z)$ as defined above) and conclude that there is a measurable function $S_k : \mathcal{S}_{D^c} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $\sum_{z\in\mathcal{Z}_\alpha\cap D} z^k = S_k(\mathcal{Z}_\alpha \cap D^c)$ a.s. Thus we have proved the

Theorem 3.1. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded open set, and let $\mathcal{S}_{D^c}$ denote the space of locally finite point configurations on D^c. For each $0 \leq k \leq \lfloor 1/\alpha \rfloor$, there is a map $S_k : \mathcal{S}_{D^c} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that the moment $\sum_{z\in\mathcal{Z}_\alpha\cap D} z^k = S_k(\mathcal{Z}_\alpha \cap D^c)$ a.s.*

3.2 Tolerance of α-GAF zeroes

Our goal in this section is to prove:

Theorem 3.2. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded open set, and let $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}^c}$ denote the space of locally finite point configurations on $\mathcal{D}^c$. For each $0 \leq k \leq \lfloor 1/\alpha \rfloor = r$, let $s_k := \sum_{z\in\mathcal{Z}_\alpha\cap D} z^k = S_k(\mathcal{Z}_\alpha \cap D^c)$, and let $\underline{s} := (s_1, \cdots, s_r)$. Define*

$$\Sigma_{s_0,\underline{s}} : \{\underline{\zeta} \in D^{s_0} : \sum_{j=1}^{s_0} \zeta_j^k = s_k, 1 \leq k \leq r\},$$

where we write $\underline{\zeta} := (\zeta_1, \cdots, \zeta_{s_0})$. Then the conditional distribution of $(\mathcal{Z}_\alpha)_{\text{in}}$ given $(\mathcal{Z}_\alpha)_{\text{out}}$ is mutually absolutely conitnuous with the Lebesgue measure on $\Sigma_{s_0,\underline{\zeta}}$.

Clearly, Theorem 3.2, together with Theorem 3.1, completes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

The proof of Theorem 3.2 can be accomplished by applying Theorem 7.2 from [GP]. This can be done by closely following the approach for establishing tolerance for the planar GAF as in [GP]; most of the argument either does not depend on the specific value of α, or the method of proof carries over from $\alpha = 1/2$ (which is the case dealt with in [GP]) to general α with minor modifications. As such, we will not provide the details of the proof here, and refer the interested reader to the supplementary note [GK] that provides the full argument for general α.

4 Proof of Theorem 2.2: Non-projection determinantal processes are tolerant

We sketch the basic idea. Consider a kernel of the form $K(x, y) = \sum_{j\geq 1} \lambda_j \varphi_j(x)\bar{\varphi}_j(y)$ where $0 \leq \lambda_j \leq 1$ and φ_j are orthonormal in $L^2(\mu)$. Let I_j be independent Bernoulli

random variables with $\mathbb{P}\{I_j = 1\} = \lambda_j$, and define $K_I(x,y) = \sum_{j\geq 1} I_j \varphi_j(x)\bar{\varphi}_j(y)$. If we sample I_js first and then a determinantal point process with kernel K_I, the resulting process is precisely the determinantal point process with kernel K (see Thereom 4.5.3 in [HKPV]). In particular, if $0 < \lambda_j < 1$ for at least one j, then the number of points in the point process is a non-constant random variable.

In general, K (rather, its associated operator $\mathcal{K}$) may have a continuous spectrum and hence we cannot write an expansion as above. However, we can write the kernel K as a convex combination of two projection kernels and extend the above idea to show that the determinantal process with kernel K is a mixture of two determinantal processes. From this, we can deduce that the given determinantal process does not have rigidity of numbers. The essential observation is that the proof of Theorem 4.5.3 in [HKPV] referred to above, does not require φ_js to be orthogonal.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let K be a locally trace-class, Hermitian, contraction kernel on $L^2(\Xi,\mu)$ which is not a projection. Then, the corresponding integral operator $\mathcal{K} = \int_0^1 \lambda dE(\lambda)$ where the projection-valued measure E has the property that $E[\delta, 1-1\delta] \neq 0$ for some $\delta > 0$.

Let f be in the range of $E[\delta, 1-\delta]$ with $\|f\|^2 = \delta$ (norms in $L^2(\mu)$). Let

$$L_0(x,y) = K(x,y) - \frac{1}{2} f(x)\bar{f}(y) \quad \text{and} \quad L_1(x,y) = K(x,y) + \frac{1}{2} f(x)\bar{f}(y).$$

Let $\mathcal{L}_0$ and $\mathcal{L}_1$ be the associated operators.

Since $\mathcal{K}$ is locally of trace-class and Hermitian and $f \in L^2(\mu)$, it follows that $\mathcal{L}_0$ and $\mathcal{L}_1$ are also locally of trace-class and Hermitian. Further, by the choice of f, it follows that they are contraction kernels on $L^2(E,\mu)$, i.e., $0 \leq \mathcal{L}_0 \leq I$ and $0 \leq \mathcal{L}_1 \leq I$. To see this, let P_δ denote the spectral projection $E[\delta, 1-\delta]$ and let $f \otimes f^*$ denote the operator on $L^2(\mu)$ that maps ψ to $\langle \psi, f\rangle f$. Then $f \otimes f^* \leq \delta P_\delta$ (in the positive definite order) and $\delta P_\delta \leq \mathcal{K} \leq (1-\delta)P_\delta$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = (K - \frac{1}{2} f \otimes f^*) \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta P_\delta,$$
$$\mathcal{L}_1 = (K + \frac{1}{2} f \otimes f^*) \leq (1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta) P_\delta.$$

This shows that $\mathcal{L}_0$ and $\mathcal{L}_1$ are positive contractions and hence, by the theorem of Macchi and Soshnikov (see the discussion preceding the statement of Theorem 2.2), there exist determinantal processes Π_0 and Π_1 with kernels L_0 and L_1, respectively.

By a result of Lyons (see Theorem 6.2 of [Ly] for the case when Ξ is a countable set), we may construct Π_0 and Π_1 on the same probability space such that every point of Π_0 is also a point of Π_1. As $\mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_0 = f \otimes f^*$ has rank one, there is at most

one point in Π_1 that is not in Π_0. along with a Bernoulli$(1/2)$ random variable ξ that is independent of Π_0 and Π_1. Define

$$\Pi = \begin{cases} \Pi_0 & \text{if } \xi = 0, \\ \Pi_1 & \text{if } \xi = 1. \end{cases}$$

We claim that Π is a determinantal point process with kernel K. To show this, fix $k \geq 1$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in E$ and let $M = (L_0(x_i, x_j))_{i,j \leq k}$ and $\mathbf{u}^t = (f(x_1), \ldots, f(x_k))$. Then, $(L_1(x_i, x_j))_{i,j \leq k} = M + \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^*$. Hence, Π has k-point intensity given by

$$\begin{aligned} p_k(x_1, \ldots, x_k) &= \frac{1}{2} \det \left(L_1(x_i, x_j)\right)_{i,j \leq k} + \frac{1}{2} \det \left(L_0(x_i, x_j)\right)_{i,j \leq k} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \det(M + \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^*) + \frac{1}{2} \det(M) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \det(M) \left(1 + \mathbf{u}^* M^{-1} \mathbf{u}\right) + \frac{1}{2} \det(M) \\ &= \det(M) \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^* M^{-1} \mathbf{u}\right) \\ &= \det \left(M + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^*\right) \end{aligned}$$

which is precisely $\det(K(x_i, x_j))_{i,j \leq k}$. This proves the claim.

Now, there exists a pre-compact set D such that $\mathbb{P}\{\Pi_1 \setminus \Pi_0 \subseteq D\} > 0$. On this event, Π_0, Π_1, Π, all agree on D^c but inside D, Π_1 has one point more than Π_0. Condition on the configuration Π_{D^c}. Depending on the value of ξ, the number of points of Π inside D can take two different values, each with positive probability (for a positive probability of configurations outside D). This proves that Π cannot have rigidity of numbers. ■

5 Determinantal processes with radial intensity measures

In this section, we will prove Theorems 2.3 and 2.4. We will take up these proofs in two separate subsections. We recall the relevant notations from Section 1, and introduce some additional notation by setting Π_n to be the d.p.p. generated by the (K_n, γ), where K_n is the truncated kernel given by

$$K_n(z, w) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} c_j z^j \overline{w}^j.$$

5.1 Proof of Theorem 2.3

Proof. We will show that Π and the Palm measure of Π at the origin can be coupled so that they are equal with positive probability. This will show that, with positive probability, a point can suitably be removed or added to Π without detection, establishing that there cannot be rigidity of the number of points. In fact, we show that the Palm measure $\widetilde{\Pi}_n$ of Π_n at the origin and Π_{n-1} can be coupled so that they are equal with a positive probability, that stays bounded away from 0 as $n \to \infty$. Then, using the fact that $\Pi_n \to \Pi$ and $\widetilde{\Pi}_n \to \widetilde{\Pi}$ weakly, we can draw the desired conclusion about Π.

To this end, we note that the joint density of Π_n is given by

$$\rho_n(z_1, \cdots, z_{n+1}) = Cc_0c_1 \cdots c_n |\Delta(z_1, \cdots, z_{n+1})|^2,$$

where $\Delta(z_1, \cdots, z_{n+1})$ is, as usual, the Vandermonde determinant formed by $z_1, \cdots, z_{n+1}$. The Palm measure $\widetilde{\Pi}_n$ of Π_n at the origin is a determinantal point process with background measure γ and kernel given by $\widetilde{K}_n(z, w) = K_n(z, w) - c_0$. Thus, $\widetilde{\Pi}_n$ has a density given by $\widetilde{\rho}_n(z_1, \cdots, z_n) = Cc_1 \cdots |z_1|^2 \cdots |z_n|^2 c_n |\Delta(z_1, \cdots, z_n)|^2$. Then the Radon Nikodym derivative of $\widetilde{\Pi}_n$ w.r.t. Π_{n-1} is given by

$$\theta_n(z_1, \cdots, z_n) = \frac{\widetilde{\rho}_n(z_1, \cdots, z_n)}{\rho_{n-1}(z_1, \cdots, z_n)} = c_n |z_1|^2 \cdots |z_n|^2.$$

The maximal probability, under any coupling of $\widetilde{\Pi}_n$ and Π_{n-1}, that the coupled random variables are equal is $\mathbb{E}_{\Pi_{n-1}}[\theta_n(z_1, \cdots, z_n) \wedge 1]$. Therefore, our goal is to show that $\mathbb{E}_{\Pi_{n-1}}[\theta_n(z_1, \cdots, z_n) \wedge 1]$ is bounded away from 0 as $n \to \infty$. One can then take a subsequential weak limit of the finite dimensional couplings and obtain a coupling of Π and $\widetilde{\Pi}$ with the desired property. We will show that, under the growth assumption on the moments as described in the statement of the theorem, $\theta_n(z_1, \cdots, z_n) = c_n |z_1|^2 \cdots |z_n|^2 \to Z$ a.s., where $Z > 0$ with positive probability. To this end, observe that we can write, using Theorem 4.7.1 in [HKPV],

$$c_n |z_1|^2 \cdots |z_n|^2 = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\Gamma_j}{\mu_j} = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(1 + \left(\frac{\Gamma_j}{\mu_j} - 1\right)\right),$$

where Γ_j-s are independent copies of the size biased random variables. Thus, it suffices to show that $\left|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\Gamma_j}{\mu_j} - 1\right)\right| < \infty$. This will be true if $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{Var}\left(\frac{\Gamma_j}{\mu_j} - 1\right) < \infty$. This is precisely the condition

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\mu_{j+1}}{\mu_j} - 1\right) < \infty.$$

This is precisely growth criterion laid out in the statement of the theorem. ∎

5.2 Proof of Theorem 2.4

We will study the variance of linear statistics of Π and Π_n, and show that under certain conditions on the coefficients, the variance of linear statistics remains bounded even as the scaling factor goes to infinity. This is enough to guarantee the rigidity of the number of points of Π in any bounded open set.

To prove Theorem 2.4, we will first state and prove an estimate on the variance of linear statistics of Π.

Proposition 5.1. *Let φ be a compactly supported Lipschitz function, supported inside the disk $B(0;r)$ with Lipschitz constant $\kappa(\varphi)$. Let $\varphi_R(z) := \varphi(z/R)$. Suppose that the growth conditions in the statement of Theorem 2.4 hold.*

Then we have

$$\mathrm{Var}\left(\int \varphi_R(z)\, d[\Pi_n](z)\right) \leq B\kappa(\varphi)^2 + \|\varphi\|_\infty^2 \rho(R), \tag{3}$$

where B is a positive number and $\rho(R)$ is a quantity that $\to 0$ as $R \to \infty$, uniformly in n and φ. The same conclusion holds for Π in place of Π_n.

To prove Proposition 5.1, we will make use of a general fact about determinantal point processes:

Lemma 5.2. *Let Π be a determinantal point process with Hermitian kernel K. Let K be a reproducing kernel with respect to its background measure γ, i.e., $K(x,y) = \int K(x,z)K(z,y)\,\mathrm{d}\gamma(z)$ for all x, y. Let φ, ψ be compactly supported continuous functions. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{Cov}\left(\int \varphi\, d\Pi, \int \psi\, d\Pi\right) = \frac{1}{2}\iint (\varphi(z)-\varphi(w))\overline{(\psi(z)-\psi(w))}|K(z,w)|^2\,\mathrm{d}\gamma(z)\,\mathrm{d}\gamma(w).$$

Proof of Proposition 5.1. We give the proof when $r = 1$, from here the general case is obtained by scaling, because any function φ supported on $B(0;r)$ is equal to the scaling Φ_r of some function Φ supported on $B(0;1)$ and having the same continuity and differentiability properties as φ. Notice that $(\Phi_r)_R = \Phi_{rR}$, so the result for φ can be deduced from the result for Φ. In what follows we deal with Π_n, the result for Π follows, for instance, from taking limits as $n \to \infty$ for the result for Π_n.

Using Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\mathrm{Var}\left(\int \varphi_R(z)\, d[\Pi_n](z)\right) = \frac{1}{2}\iint |\varphi_R(z)-\varphi_R(w)|^2|K_n(z,w)|^2\,\mathrm{d}\gamma(z)\,\mathrm{d}\gamma(w)$$

where γ is the background measure. Now,

$$|\varphi_R(z)-\varphi_R(w)|^2 = |\varphi(z/R)-\varphi(w/R)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{R^2}\kappa(\varphi)^2|z-w|^2.$$

Therefore, it suffices to bound the integral $\int_{A(R)} |\varphi(z)-\varphi(w)|^2 |K_n(z,w)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\gamma(z)\,\mathrm{d}\gamma(w)$ on the set

$$A(R) := \{(z,w) : \min\{|z|,|w|\} \le R\}$$

because outside $A(R)$, we have $\varphi_R(z) = \varphi_R(w) = 0$. We begin with

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{A(R)} |\varphi(z/R) - \varphi(w/R)|^2 |K_n(z,w)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\gamma(z)\,\mathrm{d}\gamma(w) \le & \frac{\kappa(\varphi)^2}{R^2} \int_{A_1(R)} |z-w|^2 |K_n(z,w)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\gamma(z)\,\mathrm{d}\gamma(w) \\ & + \|\varphi\|_\infty^2 \int_{A_2(R)} |K_n(z,w)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\gamma(z)\,\mathrm{d}\gamma(w)\end{aligned}$$

where, for some $a > 1$ to be specified later,

$A_1(R) = \{|z| \le aR, |w| \le aR\}$ and $A_2(R) = \{|z| \le R, |w| \ge aR\} \cup \{|w| \le R, |z| \ge aR\}$.

For the integral over $A_1(R)$, we proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{A_1(R)} |z-w|^2 |K_n(z,w)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\gamma(z)\mathrm{d}\gamma(w) \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int \left(|z|^2 - z\bar{w} - \bar{z}w + |w|^2\right) \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} c_j (z\bar{w})^j\right) \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n} c_j (\bar{z}w)^j\right) \,\mathrm{d}\gamma(z)\,\mathrm{d}\gamma(w).\end{aligned}$$

Now, we integrate the $|z-w|^2$ part term by term. Due to the radial symmetry of γ, only some specific terms from $|K_n(z,w)|^2$ contribute. For example, when we integrate the $|z|^2$ term in $|z-w|^2$, only the $c_j(z\bar{w})^j c_j(\bar{z}w)^j$,$0 \le j \le n-1$ terms in the expanded expression for $|K_n(z,w)|^2$ contribute. When we integrate $z\bar{w}$, only the $c_j(z\bar{w})^j c_{j+1}(\bar{z}w)^{j+1}$,$0 \le j \le n-2$ terms provide non-zero contributions. Due to symmetry between z and w, it is enough to bound the contribution from $(|z|^2 - z\overline{w})$ by $O(R^2)$, with the constant in the O being independent of n.

- $|z|^2$ term:

Let us introduce the change of variables by $x = |z|^2$ and $y = |w|^2$. Then the contribution in the above integral coming from

$$c_j(z\bar{w})^j c_j(\bar{z}w)^j$$

can be written as

$$\int_0^{a^2R^2} \int_0^{a^2R^2} c_j x^{j+1} c_j y^j d\mu(x) d\mu(y).$$

So, the total contribution due to all such terms, ranging from $j = 0, \cdots, n-1$ is

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_0^{a^2R^2} c_j x^{j+1} d\mu(x)\right) \left(\int_0^{a^2R^2} c_{j+1} y^j d\mu(y)\right).$$

• $z\bar{w}$ term:

As above, the contribution coming from the

$$c_j(z\bar{w})^j c_{j+1}(\bar{z}w)^{j+1}$$

is given by

$$\int_0^{a^2R^2}\int_0^{a^2R^2} c_j x^{j+1}c_{j+1}y^{j+1}d\mu(x)d\mu(y).$$

Therefore the total contribution from $0 \leq j \leq n-2$ is

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-2}\left(\int_0^{a^2R^2} c_j x^{j+1}d\mu(x)\right)\left(\int_0^{a^2R^2} c_{j+1}y^{j+1}d\mu(y)\right).$$

Recall that $c_j x^j d\mu(x)$ is a probability density, denote the corresponding random variable by Γ_{j+1}.

The contribution due to the $|z|^2$ term is $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_{j+1}\mathbb{1}_{(\Gamma_{j+1}\leq a^2R^2)}]\mathbb{P}[\Gamma_{j+1}\leq a^2R^2]$ and that due to the $z\bar{w}$ term is $\sum_{j=0}^{n-2}\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_{j+1}\mathbb{1}_{(\Gamma_{j+1}\leq a^2R^2)}]\mathbb{P}[\Gamma_{j+2}\leq a^2R^2]$.

The difference between the above two terms can be written as:

$$\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_n\mathbb{1}_{(\Gamma_n\leq a^2R^2)}]\mathbb{P}[\Gamma_n\leq a^2R^2]+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_j\mathbb{1}(\Gamma_j\leq a^2R^2)]\Big(\mathbb{P}[\Gamma_j\leq a^2R^2]-\mathbb{P}[\Gamma_{j+1}\leq a^2R^2]\Big). \tag{4}$$

All the expectations in the above are $\leq a^2R^2$, and $\mathbb{P}[\Gamma_j\leq a^2R^2]\geq\mathbb{P}[\Gamma_{j+1}\leq a^2R^2]$ because Γ_{j+1} stochastically dominates Γ_j (this is true because a random variable is stochastically dominated by its size biasing). Therefore the absolute value of (4), by a telescopic sum, is $\leq a^2R^2\mathbb{P}[\Gamma_1\leq a^2R^2]\leq a^2R^2$.

By a similar argument, expanding out the kernel $K_n(z,w)$, we see that the contribution of the integral over $A_2(R)$ is given, up to a factor of $\|\varphi\|_\infty^2$ by

$$\rho(R) := \sum_{j=0}^{n}\mathbb{P}\left[\Gamma_j\leq R^2\right]\mathbb{P}\left[\Gamma_j\geq a^2R^2\right]. \tag{5}$$

It suffices to show that $\rho(R)\to 0$ uniformly in n,φ as $R\to\infty$. Another sufficient condition is that $\int_{a^2R^2}|K(z,w)|^2d\mu(w)\to 0$ uniformly on $\{|z|\leq R\}$, in the sense that

$$\left(\sup_{|z|\leq R}\int_{a^2R^2}^{\infty}|K(z,w)|^2d\gamma(w)\right)\to_{R\to\infty}0.$$

This criterion can be particularly helpful when we have an alternate expression for K that enables us to perform estimates when $|z-w|$ is large. This is indeed the case with the important example of the Ginibre ensemble.

To see this, we aim to show that (5) is $O(1)$ as $R \to \infty$. Setting $b = 2$, we consider the Γ_j-s in two groups: $J_1 := \{j|\mu_j \leq bR^2\}$ and $J_2 := \{j|\mu_j > bR^2\}$. Let $j_* := \max\{j|j \in J_1\}$. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=0}^{n} \mathbb{P}\left[\Gamma_j \leq R^2\right] \mathbb{P}\left[\Gamma_j \geq a^2R^2\right] \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{j\in J_1} \mathbb{P}\left[\Gamma_j \geq a^2R^2\right]\right) + \left(\sum_{j\in J_2} \mathbb{P}\left[\Gamma_j \leq R^2\right]\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\mathrm{Var}\left(\Gamma_j/\mu_j\right) = \left(\frac{\mu_{j+1}}{\mu_j} - 1\right)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{X}{\mathbb{E}[X]} - 1\right)^4\right] = \left(\frac{\mu_{j+3}\mu_{j+2}\mu_{j+1}}{\mu_j} - 4\frac{\mu_{j+2}\mu_{j+1}}{\mu_j^2} + 6\frac{\mu_{j+1}}{\mu_j} - 3\right).$$

It can be checked that the asymptotics on μ_j, as described in the remark, implies

$$\mathbb{E}[(\frac{X}{\mathbb{E}[X]} - 1)^4] \leq C_\alpha/j^2.$$

Then by a Chebyshev type inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j\in J_1} \mathbb{P}\left[\Gamma_j \geq a^2R^2\right] \\
&\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\Gamma_j/\mu_j - 1\right)^4}{(a^2R^2/\mu_j^2 - 1)^4}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $j \in J_1$, we have $|\frac{a^2R^2}{\mu_j} - 1| \geq c\mu_j/a^2R^2$ (because $a >> 1$), hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j\in J_1} \mathbb{P}\left[\Gamma_j \geq a^2R^2\right] \\
&\leq C\frac{1}{(a^2R^2)^4} \sum_{j\in J_1} \mu_j^4\nu_j \\
&= C\frac{\mu_{j_*}^4}{(a^2R^2)^4} \frac{1}{\mu_{j_*}^4} \left\{\sum_{j\leq j_*} \mu_j^4\nu_j\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By our assumption on the moment sequence, this quantity $\to 0$ as $j_* \to \infty$, or equivalently, as $R \to \infty$ For $j \in J_2$, we note that $\mathbb{P}\left[\Gamma_j \leq R^2\right] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(\Gamma_j/\mu_j - 1)^4}{(R^2/\mu_j^2 - 1)^2}$. Since

$\mu_j \geq 2R^2$, we have $|\frac{R^2}{\mu_j} - 1| \geq c$. As a result, we have

$$\sum_{j \in J_2} \mathbb{P}\left[\Gamma_j \leq R^2\right] \leq C \sum_{j \in J_2} \mathbb{E}\left(\Gamma_j/\mu_j - 1\right)^4 = C \sum_{j > j_*} \nu_j,$$

which $\to 0$ as $j_* \to \infty$ (equivalently, as $R \to \infty$) by our assumption on the moment sequence. Thus, $\sum_{j=0}^{n} \mathbb{P}\left[\Gamma_j \leq R^2\right] \mathbb{P}\left[\Gamma_j \geq a^2 R^2\right] \to 0$ as $R \to \infty$, uniformly in n and φ. This allows us to obtain the desired estimate on the variance of linear statistics. ■

We are now ready to complete the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Let D be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{C}$. We will first establish the rigidity of the number of points in D.

To do so, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we will construct a function Ψ_ε with the following properties:

- $\Psi_\varepsilon \equiv 1$ on D
- $\|\Psi_\varepsilon\|_\infty \leq 1$
- $\kappa(\Psi_\varepsilon) < \sqrt{\varepsilon}$.

Then, considering the dilations $(\Psi^\varepsilon)_R$, we get via Proposition 5.1 that for large enough R we have

- $(\Psi_\varepsilon)_R \equiv 1$ on D
- $\|(\Psi_\varepsilon)_R\|_\infty \leq 1$
- $\mathrm{Var}\left(\int (\Psi^\varepsilon)_R d[\Pi]\right) < C\varepsilon$.

Appealing to Theorem 6.1 in [GP], we deduce that the number of points in D is rigid.

Let r_0 denote the radius of the disk D. We construct the function Ψ_ε as follows:

$$\Psi_\varepsilon(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } 0 \leq r \leq r_0, \\ -\varepsilon \log r + \varepsilon \log r_0 + 1 & \text{for } r_0 \leq r \leq r_0 \exp(1/\varepsilon), \\ 0 & \text{for } r \geq r_0 \exp(1/\varepsilon)\ . \end{cases}$$

It is a simple computation to check that Ψ_ε defined above has the desired properties.

For the tolerance of the points in D, subject to the constraint on the number of points, we will mention the crucial point here and refer the reader to the accompanying note [GK] for the details. It turns out that the estimate 3 for Π_n-s, coupled with the additions moment assumption in the statement of our theorem, is enough to establish that the inverse power sums

$$\left(\sum_{z \in \Pi_n \cap \mathcal{D}^c} \frac{1}{z^k} \right)$$

is bounded above in expectation. Exploiting this as a crucial fact, and employing the techniques introduced in [GP] to deal with the Ginibre ensemble, it can be shown that Π is rigid of order 1. ■

6 Perturbed lattice in one dimension

Consider $\Pi = \{X_k \ : \ k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ where $X_k \sim N(k, \sigma_k^2)$ are independent random variables. We want to consider the special case of $\sigma_k^2 = k^{2\beta}$ and understand the issue of rigidity and tolerance, depending on the parameter β.

$\underline{\beta > 1/2 :}$

For simplicity of notation, we work with perturbed $\mathbb{N}$, i.e., $\{X_k$ such that $k \geq 1\}$. The proof for the case of $\mathbb{Z}$ (instead of $\mathbb{N}$) is similar. Let $\mu = \mathcal{L}(X_1, X_2, \ldots)$ and $\nu = \mathcal{L}(X_2, X_3, \ldots)$, where by the notation $\mathcal{L}(\underline{Y})$ we denote the law of the random sequence $\underline{Y}$. We claim that μ and ν are mutually absolutely continuous and hence, the process Π is insertion tolerant (that is, given any bounded domain D and the point configuration Π we can introduce a new point in D and still remain in the support of Π). In particular, this implies that there is no rigidity of numbers in Π. To see this, note that the function mapping the sequence $(X_1, X_2, \cdots, \infty)$ to the point set $\{X_1, X_2 \cdots, \infty\}$ is measurable, hence $\mu \equiv \nu$ implies $\Pi \equiv \widetilde{\Pi}$ (where $\widetilde{\Pi}$ is the point process corresponding to $(X_2, \cdots, \infty)$), hence these have the same support. But by a trivial coupling, Π contains one more point than the corresponding realization of $\widetilde{X}$, which (being a Gaussian perturbation of 1) could be inside any given interval in $\mathbb{R}$ with positive probability . Since the distributions of Π and $\widetilde{X}$ have the same support, we conclude that the point process Π is insertion tolerant in the sense described above.

To compare μ and ν, we will invoke Kakutani's Dichotomy Theorem. Fix k and let $\mu = k$, $\mu' = k+1$, $\sigma = k^\beta$ and $\sigma' = (k+1)^\beta$. Then, the Radon-Nikodym derivative of X_k to X_{k+1} is

$$f_k(x) = \frac{\sigma'}{\sigma} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{(x-\mu')^2}{\sigma'^2} \right] \right\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\int \sqrt{f_k}d\nu &= \sqrt{\frac{\sigma'}{\sigma}}\frac{1}{\sigma'\sqrt{2\pi}}\int \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{4}\left[\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{\sigma^2}-\frac{(x-\mu')^2}{\sigma'^2}\right]\right\}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\frac{(x-\mu')^2}{\sigma'^2}\right\}dx\\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma\sigma'}\sqrt{2\pi}}\int \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{4}\left[\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{\sigma^2}+\frac{(x-\mu')^2}{\sigma'^2}\right]\right\}dx\\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma\sigma'}\sqrt{2\pi}}\int \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{4\sigma^2\sigma'^2}(ax^2+bx+c)\right\}dx\end{aligned}$$

where $a=\sigma^2+\sigma'^2$, $b=-2\mu\sigma'^2-2\mu'\sigma^2$ and $c=\mu^2\sigma'^2+\mu'^2\sigma^2$. Note that $\int e^{-\frac{1}{2}(Ax^2+Bx+C)}dx = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{A}}e^{(B^2-4AC)/2A}$. In our case, $A=a/2\sigma^2\sigma'^2$, $B=b/2\sigma^2\sigma'^2$ and $C=c/2\sigma^2\sigma'^2$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\int \sqrt{f_k}d\nu &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma\sigma'}\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{2\sigma^2\sigma'^2}}{\sqrt{a}}\exp\left\{-\frac{(\mu-\mu')^2}{\sigma^2+\sigma'^2}\right\}\\ &= \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma\sigma'}{\sigma^2+\sigma'^2}}\exp\left\{-\frac{(\mu-\mu')^2}{\sigma^2+\sigma'^2}\right\}\\ &= \sqrt{1-\frac{(\sigma-\sigma')^2}{\sigma^2+\sigma'^2}}\exp\left\{-\frac{(\mu-\mu')^2}{\sigma^2+\sigma'^2}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Plugging the values of $\mu=k$, $\sigma=k^\beta$ etc., we get

$$\int \sqrt{f_k}d\nu = \sqrt{1-O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)}\exp\left\{-O\left(\frac{1}{k^{2\beta}}\right)\right\}$$

from which it immediately follows that $\prod_k(\int\sqrt{f_k}d\nu)>0$. By Kakutani's Theorem, $\mu\equiv\nu$.

$\underline{\beta\le 1/2:}$

For a compactly supported test function h, let $h_L(x)=h(x/L)$. Let $\sigma^2(h_L)=\mathrm{Var}(\sum_{x\in\Pi}h_L(x))=\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathrm{Var}(h_L(X_k))$. We shall consider h to be a compactly supported non-negative Lipschitz function supported on $[-1,1]$ such that $h\equiv 1$ in a neighbourhood of the origin, and $\|h\|_\infty=1$. Then, $|h_L(x)-h_L(y)|\le\kappa(h)|x-y|/L$, where $\kappa(h)$ is the Lipschitz constant of h. Hence we have

$$\mathrm{Var}(h_L(X_k))=\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[(h_L(X_k)-h_L(Y_k))^2]\le\frac{\kappa(h)^2}{2L^2}\mathbb{E}[(X_k-Y_k)^2]=\kappa(h)^2\frac{\sigma_k^2}{2L^2}.$$

We use this bound for $|k|\le 10L$ and get

$$\sum_{|k|\le 10L}\mathrm{Var}(h_L(X_k))\le\frac{\kappa(h)^2}{L^2}\sum_{k=1}^{10L}k^{2\beta}\lesssim\kappa(h)^2L^{-1+2\beta}. \tag{6}$$

For $|k| > 10L$, we note that $h_L(X_k) - h_L(Y_k) = 0$ unless one of X_k or Y_k falls in the interval $[-L, L]$. In any case, the difference is bounded by 1, because we have $0 \le h(x) \le 1$ for any x. Hence (for simplicity of notation, let k be positive),

$$\mathrm{Var}(h_L(X_k)) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[(h_L(X_k) - h_L(Y_k))^2] \le \mathbb{P}\{|X_k - k| \ge k - L\} \le e^{-(k-L)^2/2\sigma_k^2}.$$

For $k > 10L$, we see that $(k-L)^2 \ge k^2/4$ while $\sigma_k^2 = k^{2\beta} \le k$ and hence

$$\sum_{|k|>10L} \mathrm{Var}(h_L(X_k)) \le e^{-L/10}. \tag{7}$$

From (6) and (7) we see that $\sigma^2(h_L) \le C\kappa(h)^2 L^{-1+2\beta}$ (for large enough L, depending on h).

Suppose we want to prove that the number of points of Π in a bounded interval $D \subset \mathbb{R}$ is rigid. For $\varepsilon > 0$, we define h_ε as Ψ_ε in the proof of Theorem 2.4 in Section 5.2. It is easy to see that, for large enough L (depending on ε), $\sigma^2(h_L) \le c\varepsilon^2$. We can again invoke Theorem 6.2 from [GP] to show that we have the desired rigidity of the number of points in D.

Now fix any interval $[-A, A]$ and condition on $\Pi \cap [-A, A]^c$. Find L large enough so that $\sigma^2(h_L) < \varepsilon^3$. Coupled with Theorem 6.2 in [GP], this suffices to establish that the number of points in A is rigid.

Level of rigidity for $\beta \le 1/2$:

By looking at the random sequence $(X_1, X_2, \cdots, \infty)$, we notice that for each realization of the random sequence, the points that occur inside any bounded interval A have a joint density (coming from the Gaussians). Hence could be in any other possible locations in A (w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure) with positive probability density. Hence, for $\beta \ge 1/2$, the point process Π is rigid at level 1.

7 Appendix: Alternate definitions of tolerance

We discuss the relationship between tolerance and strong tolerance. For that we state an equivalent condition for tolerance.

Lemma 7.1. *Consider the following statements.*

(A) Let (Π, D) be tolerant subject to $\{f_1, \ldots, f_m\}$.

(B) With positive probability, the conditional distribution of Π_D given Π_{D^c} is mutually absolutely continuous to the conditional distribution of Π_D given $\sigma\{f_1(\Pi_D), \ldots, f_m(\Pi_D)\}$.

(C) *With probability one, the conditional distribution of* Π_D *given* Π_{D^c} *is mutually absolutely continuous to the conditional distribution of* Π_D *given* $\sigma\{f_1(\Pi_D), \ldots, f_m(\Pi_D)\}$.

Then (C) $\implies$ (B) $\implies$ (A).

As (C) is the same as strong tolerance and (A) is the same a tolerance, in particular it follows that strong tolerance implies tolerance. The intermediate statement (B) is put in to show that there are other possibilities. Let us first give an example.

Example 7.1. *Let* Π_1 *be the infinite Ginibre ensemble. Let* Π_2 *be a Poisson process with unit intensity on the plane. Let* ξ *be a Ber*$(1/2)$ *random variable. Assume that* Π_1, Π_2, ξ *are independent. Set* $\Pi = \Pi_1$ *if* $\xi = 0$ *and* $\Pi = \Pi_2$ *is* $\xi = 1$. *Then* Π *is a stationary point process.*

If D *is a bounded set, then from* Π_{D^c} *we can deduce* ξ *and then, we may or may not be able to deduce the number of points in* D *depending on the value of* ξ. *Hence* $\mathcal{R}_D$ *is trivial. Further, if* $\xi = 0$, *then the conditional distribution of* Π_D *given* Π_{D^c} *is Poisson process on* D. *If* $\xi = 1$, *the conditional distribution of* Π_D *is supported on collection of* N *points where* N *is a function of* Π_{D^c}. *Thus,* Π *satisfies* (A) *and* (B) *but not* (C).

Playing the same game with Ginibre and GAF zeroes, we can get a stationary point process which is rigid for numbers, which is tolerant subject to numbers, but which is not strongly tolerant subject to numbers.

One might wonder if the point process in the above example is somehow unnatural. For instance, it is not ergodic. Here is an example to show that such a difference can occur even under ergodicity, mixing and tail triviality.

Example 7.2. *Let* ξ_n, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, *be i.i.d. with* $\mathbb{P}\{\xi_n = 0\} = \mathbb{P}\{\xi_n = 1\} = \frac{1}{2}$. *Define*

$$X_n = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \xi_n = 1 \text{ or } \xi_{n-1} = \xi_{n+1} = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Then $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ *is stationary. Since* $(X_k)_{k\le n}$ *and* $(X_k)_{k\ge n+3}$ *are independent (a property known as 2-dependent),* X *is tail-trivial, ergodic and mixing in every sense.*

Condition on $(X_k)_{k\neq 0}$. *If* $X_1 = X_{-1} = 1$, *then we can easily deduce that* $X_0 = 1$. *However, for any of the other three possible values for* (X_1, X_{-1}), *the conditional distribution of* X_0 *gives positive probability to both* 0 *and* 1. *It should also be noted that* (X_1, X_{-1}) *takes all four values with positive probability.*

Regard X *as a point process on* $\mathbb{Z}$ *and let* $D = \{0\}$. *Then* $\mathcal{R}_D$ *is trivial,* (B) *holds, but not* (C).

It is also possible to satisfy (A) without satisfying (B).

Example 7.3. *Let* $\Omega = \{1,2\} \times \{1,2,3\}$ *with uniform probability distribution. Let* $X(i,j) = j$ *and*

$$Y(1,2) = Y(1,3) = 1, \quad Y(2,1) = Y(2,3) = 2, \quad Y(1,2) = Y(2,2) = 3.$$

Then, $\sigma\{X\} \cap \sigma\{Y\}$ *is trivial. However, for any* $\omega \in \Omega$*, the conditional distribution of* X *given* Y *is supported on exactly two of the points* $1, 2, 3$*.*

To make an example involving point processes, let (i,j) *be sampled uniformly from* Ω*. Given* (i,j)*, let* Π *be a Poisson process on* $\mathbb{R}$ *with intensity* $X(i,j)$ *on* $(-1,1)$ *and intensity* $Y(i,j)$ *on* $(-1,1)^c$*. Then the process* Π *satisfies* (A) *but not* (B)*.*

Proof of Lemma 7.1. We only need to prove that (B) implies (A).

If (A) were not true, we could find $f : \mathcal{S}_D \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that (a) f is rigid for Π, (b) there is no random variable measurable with respect to $\sigma\{f_1(\Pi_D), \dots, f_m(\Pi_D)\}$ that is equal to $f(\Pi_D)$ $a.s.$ In particular, $f(\Pi_D)$ is not a constant and in fact, with positive probability, the conditional distribution of $f(\Pi_D)$ given $\sigma\{f_1(\Pi_D), \dots, f_m(\Pi_D)\}$ is not degenerate. Hence, with positive probability, the conditional distribution of Π_D given $\sigma\{f_1(\Pi_D), \dots, f_m(\Pi_D)\}$ gives probability less than one to any level set of f. But the rigidity of f implies that, almost surely, the conditional distribution of Π_D given Π_{D^c} is supported inside a level set of f. This contradicts (B). ■

References

[BQ] Bufetov, A. I. and Qiu, Y., *Equivalence of Palm measures for determinantal point processes associated with Hilbert spaces of holomorphic functions*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 353 (2015), no. 6, 551-555.

[BDQ] Bufetov, A.I., Dabrowski, Y., and Qiu, Y., *Linear rigidity of stationary stochastic processes*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.00670

[Buf-3] Bufetov, A.I., *Rigidity of Determinantal Point Processes with the Airy, the Bessel and the Gamma Kernel*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.07581

[DaV] Daley, D. J. and Vere Jones, D. *An Introduction to the Theory of Point Processes (Vols. I & II)*, Springer, 1997.

[DM] Dym, H. and McKean, H. P., *Gaussian processes, function theory, and the inverse spectral problem*, Probability and Mathematical Statistics, Vol. 31. Academic Press.

[G-I] Ghosh, S., *Determinantal processes and completeness of random exponentials: the critical case*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1211.2435, Probability Theory and Relted Fields (to appear).

[G-II] Ghosh, S., *Palm measures and rigidity phenomena in point processes*, in preparation.

[GK] Ghosh, S., *Notes on tolerance for point processes*, in preparation.

[GP] Ghosh, S. and Peres, Y., *Rigidity and Tolerance in point processes: Gaussian zeroes and Ginibre eigenvalues*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1211.2381, Duke Mathematical Journal (to appear).

[GKP] Ghosh, S., Krishnapur, M. and Peres, Y., *Continuum Percolation for Gaussian zeroes and Ginibre eigenvalues*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1211.2514v1.

[Gin] Ginibre, J., *Statistical ensembles of complex, quaternion, and real matrices*, Journal of Mathematical Physics, (1965).

[HS] Holroyd, A. E. and Soo, T., *Insertion and deletion tolerance of point processes*, Electron. J. Probab. 18, (2013), no. 74.

[HKPV] Hough, J. B., Krishnapur, M., Peres, Y. and Virág, B., *Zeros of Gaussian Analytic Functions and Determinantal Point Processes*, Providence, RI, American Mathematical Society, (2009).

[Ka] Kallenberg, O., *Random Measures*, Akademie-Verlag · Berlin and Academic Press, 1983.

[Ly] Lyons, R., *Determinantal Probability Measures*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci., 98, 167-212, 2003.

[LySt] Lyons, R. and Steif, J., *Stationary determinantal processes: Phase multiplicity, Bernoullicity, entropy, and domination*, Duke Math. J., Volume 120, Number 3 (2003), 515–575.

[NS] Nazarov, F. and Sodin, M., *Random Complex Zeroes and Random Nodal Lines*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. III, 1450–1484, 2010.

[NS] Nazarov, F. and Sodin, M., *Fluctuations in Random Complex Zeroes: Asymptotic Normality Revisited*, Int. Math. Res. Not., Vol. 2011, No. 24, 5720–5759, 2011.

[NSV] Nazarov, F., Sodin, M. and Volberg, A., *Transportation to random zeroes by the gradient flow. Geometric and Functional Analysis*, Vol 17-3, 887–935, 2007.

[Os] Osada, H., *Interacting Brownian motions in infinite dimensions with logarithmic interaction potentials*, Annals of Probability, Vol.41, 2013.

[OsSh] Osada, H. and Shirai, T., *Absolute continuity and singularity of Palm measures of the Ginibre point process*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1406.3913.

[PS] Peres, Y. and Sly, A., *Rigidity and tolerance for perturbed lattices*, http://arxiv.org/abs/arXiv:1409.4490

[ST1] Sodin, M. and Tsirelson, B., *Random complex zeroes. I. Asymptotic normality*, Israel J. Math. **144** (2004), 125-149.

[Sosh] Soshnikov, A., *Determinantal random point fields*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **55**, (2000), no. 5(335), 107–160; translation in Russian Math. Surveys **55** (2000), no. 5, 923-975